

100



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,464	12/19/2001	Patrick Fogarty	TOSK-004CON	4583
24353	7590	03/22/2004	EXAMINER	
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP			CHIN, CHRISTOPHER L	
200 MIDDLEFIELD RD				
SUITE 200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MENLO PARK, CA 94025			1641	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/024,464

Applicant(s)

FOGARTY, PATRICK

Examiner

Chris L. Chin

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Group I – claims 1-16 in the paper dated 12/22/03 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
(a.) The status of the parent application cited on page 1 of the specification needs to be updated.
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-7, 10-13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wasserkort et al (Journal of Applied Toxicology, 17(2), 1997, pp. 119-125).

Wasserkort et al discloses the screening of toxic compounds using *drosophila melanogaster* (see abstract and introduction). The method comprises exposing chemicals to about 10-20 flies and determining the effect of the chemicals on CO₂ production is determined (see pages 119-120, experimental).

5. Claims 1-7, 10-13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lynch et al (Teratogenesis, Carcinogenesis, and Mutagenesis, 1991, 11:147-173).

Lynch et al disclose a method of screening developmental toxicant using *drosophila*. The method comprises exposing the flies (at least 200) to chemicals and determining the effects of the chemicals on mortality and morphology of the flies (see pages 149-151, Materials and Methods).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 8-9 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasserkort et al (Journal of Applied Toxicology, 17(2), 1997, pp. 119-125) or Lynch et al (Teratogenesis, Carcinogenesis, and Mutagenesis, 1991, 11:147-173).

See above for the teachings of Wasserkort et al and Lynch et al.

Wasserkort et al or Lynch et al differ from the instant invention because they fail to teach 100 or 1000 compound compositions being tested simultaneously.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to test 100 to 1000 compound compositions simultaneously in order to accomplish a large scale screening process with a minimal time requirement.

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,365,129. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because patent '129 claims a method with essentially the same limitations as the instant invention.

Patent '129 claims a high throughput toxicology screening method in which at least 10 different compound compositions are simultaneously assayed for toxicity. The method comprises simultaneously assaying at least 10 different compound compositions for toxicity, wherein each of said at least 10 different compound compositions is assayed for toxicity by:

(a) contacting said compound compositions with a plurality of non-mammalian multi-cellular organisms; and

(b) determining the effect of said compound composition on said non-mammalian multi-cellular organisms;

wherein each of said compound compositions is selected from the group consisting of known pharmacologically active compounds, chemical analogs thereof, and new candidate pharmacologically active agents.

The method of patent '129 differs from the instant invention in teaching specific compound compositions that are to be tested.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the instant method is obvious over the method of patent '129 because the open "comprising" language of the instant claims does not exclude the specific compound compositions recited in the method of patent '129.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chris L. Chin whose telephone number is 571-272-0815. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Christopher L. Chin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1641

March 21, 2004